

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO	
09/453,109 12/02/1999		MARK R. PRAUSNITZ	BVTP-P01-539	2183
28120 FISH & NEAV	7590 04/25/200 TE IP GROUP		EXAMINER	
ROPES & GRA	AY LLP	•	WINAKUR, ERIC FRANK	
ONE INTERNATIONAL PLACE BOSTON, MA 02110-2624			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
• .			3768	
•				
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/25/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Γ	Ĵ
X	p
	-

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
09/453,109	PRAUSNITZ ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Eric F. Winakur	3768		

Bororo aro r ming or an Appear Brief	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Eric F. Winakur	3768					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
		•					
HE REPLY FILED 4/12/07 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	g date of the final rejection.						
The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).							
extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee ander 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
	hrief in compliance with 37 CFR 41	37 must he filed withi	n two months of				
. The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>09 February 2007</u> . A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).							
AMENDMENTS							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,			ecause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co		I E below);					
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in beappeal; and/or 	• •	ducing or simplifying	the issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a		ected claims.					
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.	• **						
1. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s							
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 	illowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the				
7. X For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)		II be entered and an e	explanation of				
how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	ovided below or appended.						
Claim(s) allowed: 47-55.							
Claim(s) objected to: <u>5,8,9,13,26,38,39,42 and 43</u> .	Claim(s) objected to: <u>5,8,9,13,26,38,39,42 and 43</u> .						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4,6,7,10-12,14-18,20-22,24,25,27-3</u>	<u>7,40,41 and 44-46</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a				
showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1). 1. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.							
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by	ut does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:				
2. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).							
13. Other:		735					
		Frio E Minster					
		Eric F Winakur Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3768					

Continuation of 3. NOTE: As Applicant notes in the remarks, three new independent claims were included with the proposed amendment which recite features allegedly not found in the cited art (in particular, a porous microneedle, a microneedle comprising a polymer, and a substrate and/or microneedle made from a flexible material are found in the three newly added claims, respectively). These newly added features constitute new issues that would require further search and consideration. In addition, Applicant has updated the dependencies of certain dependent claims, which at least requires consideration of adequacy of disclosure under 112, first paragraph of any previously unclaimed combinations of features.